

## **REMARKS**

Claims 3-5 and 8 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 have been cancelled. Claim 8 has been added. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Minor amendments have been made to the specification to simply mirror the language in the claims as originally filed. Claims 3 and 5 have been rewritten in independent form, while new claim 8 is a copy of claim 4 that depends from claim 5. Support for the amendments and the new claim can be found in the written description, drawings, and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection has been accommodated. Applicant has revised claim 5 to incorporate the limitations of claims 1 and 2.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Krymski et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,809,766, hereinafter Krymski). Claims 1-2 and 6-7 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 3, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 3 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 3 and 5 to include the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Therefore, claims 3 and 5 should now be in condition for allowance. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 3, and a copy of claim 4, claim 8, depends from claim 5.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 13, 2007

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/MRN/ma